



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/917,449	07/27/2001	Edward Acosta	BRDC:20	9696
29395	7590	06/14/2006	EXAMINER	
H. DALE LANGLEY, JR. THE LAW FIRM OF H. DALE LANGLEY, JR. PC 610 WEST LYNN AUSTIN, TX 78703			SHAH, CHIRAG G	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2616	

DATE MAILED: 06/14/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	.09/917,449	ACOSTA ET AL.
	Examiner Chirag G. Shah	Art Unit 2616

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 31 March 2006.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-3 and 5-8 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-3 and 5-8 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Claims 1-3, 5-8, 19-22 and 28 rejected under 35 USC 112, first paragraph has been withdrawn based on Amendment filed on 3/31/06.
2. Applicant's arguments filed 3/31/06 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues that the transactions contemplated by Liao are secured between client and server, via encryption/decryption/key, etc. Applicant deems the particular protocols for the communications are nonetheless "standard" network protocols, but merely encrypted and secured. Applicant further claims that there is not any mention of non-standard protocols for wireless communications. Examiner respectfully disagrees for several reasons. Primarily, the specification does not provide a definition or even explain what is considered to be a "non-standard protocol" versus "standard protocol". Since there is no specific definition mentioned to distinguish the standard and non-standard protocols, the Examiner based on MPEP 2106, gives claims their broadest reasonable interpretation in light of the supporting disclosure. In re Morris, 127 F.3d 1048, 1054-55, 44 USPQ2d 1023, 1027-28 (Fed. Cir. 1997). In this case, as Liao discloses in col. 6, lines 18-46, protocols such as Secure Uplink Gateway Protocol (SUCP) and Handheld Device Transport Protocol (HDTP) that provide secure and encrypted communication used primarily for proprietary communication is being reasonably interpreted as specialized non-standard communications protocols. Whereas, HTTP that runs on a standard TCP protocol suite is as admitted by the Applicant considered a standard network protocol. Thus, based on the reasons provided, claims 1-3 and 5-8 respectfully remain rejected under 35 USC 102(e).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

4. Claims 1-3 and 5-8 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Specifically, the term, “specialized non-standard protocols” is indefinite and the specification does not provide the distinction between “standard network protocol” and “specialized non-standard protocol”.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

6. Claims 1-3 and 5-8 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Liao et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,148,405), hereinafter, referred as Liao.

Regarding claim 1, Liao discloses in **figure 1** of a wireless communications network [**wireless communication network 100, fig. 1**], comprising: a wired network [**Landline 104, figure 1**],

a wireless channel [**CDPD system 108, as disclosed in figure 1 and in col. 5, lines 54-62, 102 controlled by carrier 108 CDPD, Note: CDPD transmits data packets on unused cellular channels in the 800MHz to 900MHz range) communicate with each other using a radio transmission**];

a wireless application service provider server computer [**114 link server, fig. 1**] connected to the wired network [**landline 104, fig. 1**], operable via standard network protocols [**HTTP/HXML, fig. 1**] for wired communications over the wired network [**landline 104, fig. 1**], and operatively dedicated for effecting communications over the wireless channel [**CDPD wireless network**] via specialized non-standard protocols [**HDTTP, SUGP, see fig. 1 and col. 6, lines 18-39, secure uplink gateway protocol can be considered non-standard proprietary protocol that requires a specific encrypted authentication**];

a wireless packetized data communications provider equipment [**Airnet 102 controlled by carrier CDPD 108 provides packet data transfer from wireless network 108, see fig. 1**] connected to the wireless application service provider server computer [**link server 114, see fig. 1**], for effecting communications of the server computer over the wireless channel [**CDPD channel, see fig. 1**];

a wireless device [**mobile device 106, see fig. 1**] for communicating over the wireless channel [**CDPD channel, see fig. 1**], via the wireless packetized data communications provider equipment [**Airnet 102 controlled by carrier CDPD 108 provides packet data transfer from wireless network 108, see fig. 1**], with the server computer [**114 link server, fig. 1**];

wherein the wireless device [**mobile device 106, see fig. 1**] communicates over the wireless channel [**CDPD Channel, see fig. 1**] via specialized non-standard protocols [**HDTTP,**

SUGP, see fig. 1 and col. 6, lines 18-39, secure uplink gateway protocol can be considered non-standard proprietary protocol that requires a specific encrypted authentication];

wherein the server computer [114 link server, fig. 1] is dedicated for communications with the wireless device [mobile device 106, see fig. 1], through the provider equipment [Airnet 102 controlled by carrier CDPD 108 provides packet data transfer from wireless network 108, see fig. 1] over the wireless channel [CDPD Channel, see fig. 1], via the specialized non-standard protocols [HDTP, SUGP, see fig. 1 and col. 6, lines 18-39, secure uplink gateway protocol can be considered non-standard proprietary protocol that requires a specific encrypted authentication];

wherein the server computer [114 link server, fig. 1] intermediates communications of the wireless device [mobile device 106, see fig. 1] to be carried over the wired network [landline 104, fig. 1], by communicating with the wireless device [mobile device 106, see fig. 1] via the specialized non-standard protocols [HDTP, SUGP, see fig. 1 and col. 6, lines 18-39, secure uplink gateway protocol can be considered non-standard proprietary protocol that requires a specific encrypted authentication] and correspondingly communicating over the wired network via standard network protocols [The wired network 104 operates according to an open systems interconnect model protocol since as disclosed in col. 6, 18-23, HTTP is the protocol used in the wired Internet 104, which is a built in the TCP/IP Protocol Suite, corresponding to transport of network layers of the OSI (open system-interconnect) model as claim protocol].

Regarding claim 2, Liao further discloses of the wireless communications network [CDPD system 108, as disclosed in figure 1 and in col. 5, lines 54-62, 102 controlled by carrier 108 CDPD, Note: CDPD transmits data packets on unused cellular channels in the 800MHz to 900MHz range) communicate with each other using a radio transmission], further comprising a client software [HMDL web browser, fig 1 and col. 6, lines 23-30] stored on the wireless device [mobile device 106, see fig. 1] for enabling wireless communications over the wireless channel [CDPD channel, see fig. 1] by the wireless device [mobile device 106, see fig. 1] with the server computer [link server 114, see fig. 1], via the provider equipment [Airnet 102 controlled by carrier CDPD 108 provides packet data transfer from wireless network 108, see fig. 1], according to the specialized non-standard protocols [HDTTP, SUGP, see fig. 1 and col. 6, lines 18-39, secure uplink gateway protocol can be considered non-standard proprietary protocol that requires a specific encrypted authentication].

Regarding claim 3, Liao discloses in figure 1, col. 6, 18-23, of the wired network (104). The wired network 104 operates according to an open systems interconnect model protocol since as disclosed in col. 6, 18-23, HTTP is the protocol used in the wired Internet 104, which is a built in the TCP/IP Protocol Suite, corresponding to transport of network layers of the OSI (open system-interconnect) model as claim protocol

[for further reference of HTTP being a part of the TCP/IP Protocol Suite corresponding to the OSI model, see Data & Computer Communications, 6th Edition by William Stallings, pages 52-53 & 59].

Regarding claim 5, Liao discloses in **fig. 1, col. 5, lines 49-56**, wherein the wired network [104, fig. 1] is the Internet as claim.

Regarding claim 6, Liao discloses **fig. 1, col. 5, lines 55-65**, wherein the wireless channel is a cellular packetized data [**GSM**] system as claim.

Regarding claim 7, Liao discloses in **fig. 1, col. 5, lines 55-65** wherein the wireless channel is a CDPD system as claim.

Regarding claim 8, Liao discloses in **fig. 1 and col. 6, lines 18-23**, further comprising a server software [**HMDL web browser software running on 114, as in fig. 1 and col. 6, lines 18-38**] operable on the wireless application service provider server computer [**link server 114, fig. 1**] for enabling wireless communications via specialized non-standard protocols [**HDTP, SUGP, see fig. 1 and col. 6, lines 18-39, secure uplink gateway protocol can be considered non-standard proprietary protocol that requires a specific encrypted authentication**] between the server computer [**link server 114, fig. 1**] and the wireless device [**mobile device 106, fig. 1**], having the client software [**HMDL Browser, see fig. 1**], over the wireless channel [**CDMA system 108, fig. 1**] as claim.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Chirag G. Shah whose telephone number is 571-272-3144. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Doris To can be reached on 571-272-7682. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

cgs
June 5, 2006



Chirag G. Shah
Patent Examiner, 2616